



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## WEARING THE HAT

A. T. OLMSTEAD

University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

If it were necessary to furnish a text for this more than lay sermon, it could be found in II Macc. 4:12, "and he caused the noblest of the youth to wear the hat." You will remember the circumstances, how Seleucus was succeeded by the wicked Antiochus Epiphanes, how the renegade priest who took the worse than pagan name of Jason bribed the king to give him the high priesthood instead of his brother, how he showed his Hellenic sympathies by setting up a gymnasium under the acropolis, instituted that ancient Greek anticipation of our S.A.T.C., the epheboi, followed the usual Hellenistic custom of exchange of citizenship by registering the men of Jerusalem as Antiochenes, how he destroyed the ancestral institutions and brought in new and illegal customs, and made the noblest of the epheboi to wear the hat. With this we have the very acme of Hellenization, the advance to the attack of a foreign religion, for the priests lost all enthusiasm for the service of the altar which they hastily abandoned for the enjoyment of the illegal sport of the palaestra when proclamation was made that the discus game was about to begin. We have here a furious indictment of Hellenism, and—here is the anomaly which colors the whole of Jewish history—it is epitomized from the account written by a man bearing this same pagan name of Jason; it is written in Greek so good that the full force is lost unless we carefully translate the technical language with the meaning it held for the Greek world roundabout; it was written to glorify a family which, by the time of its composition, had definitely taken its place in the Hellenistic concert of nations.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This paper was originally presented before the Chicago Society of Biblical Research, November 16, 1918, and is confessedly no more than a sketch of the Jewish history during a certain period and from a certain point of view. Limitations of time and space have accordingly prevented discussion of many details of interest. The point of view has been developed during eight years of the teaching of ancient history

The wearing of the hat has always, from the days of Alexander to the present, marked the West from the East. However much the higher classes of the present-day Orient may adorn themselves with European clothes, one rarely indeed sees a true oriental wearing the hat. It is still the symbol, as it was to the unknown author of II Maccabees, of complete Europeanization.

The period of contact between the classic civilization and the Jews has always been of the most intense interest to students of the past. As the period between the Testaments, as the preparation for Christianity, as the background for developed Judaism, it has attracted countless investigators. The increased interest in the Hellenistic world and in the Roman Empire which has characterized the last two generations has led the greatest writers in these fields to study the relationship of the classic world to the Jews as a most important element in administration and in civilization, and one for whose study we are fortunate in having an unusually large amount of first-hand source material. These results are now in process of assimilation by biblical scholars, and the consummation of the process will undoubtedly change in many respects views now current among narrower specialists.

One looks in vain for similar studies from the standpoint of general oriental history. Our study of the Orient has tended to cease with the downfall of the Semites; at the best the Persian Empire has held our attention until the coming of Alexander. Thereafter we have labeled the history as classical until our interest has been revived by the coming of the Arabs. A few specialists in Syriac literature have prevented us from forgetting that Rome had a rival to the East, but in the actual thinking

---

at the University of Missouri. Each semester, in a general course in that subject, the Jews were used as the best illustration, through wealth of source material if not exactness in type, of the limitations of Hellenization and of the inevitableness of the oriental reaction. During the same period the general subject of the seminary in ancient history, conducted primarily for the benefit of students of the classical world, was the interrelation of East and West. In succeeding years the entire field was canvassed in detail and thus the background of the present article secured. In the emphasis on the more purely secular elements there is naturally a considerable distortion in proportion and emphasis, but no more than has been the result of a too great emphasis on the religious, and the two will tend to balance each other in the mind of the future historian.

processes of the average scholar it has been assumed as a matter of course that Luke 2:1 should be taken literally, that all the inhabited world was in reality under the sway of Caesar Augustus. The sources for Parthian history and, in only slightly less degree, for the Sassanid Persian, are in large part Greek or Latin, and of a type which has no attraction as literature. The classical scholar has no interest in it, the non-classical is barely aware of its existence. For other sources we must plow through reams of wearisome sermons in Syriac, extract the grains of truth in romances woven by Arab or Persian historian, decipher the almost hopeless Pehlevi in sacred books, inscriptions, or coins. And withal we must have the oriental point of view. No cause for surprise, then, that Rawlinson has had no successor to his *Sixth and Seventh Monarchies*, that little of the preliminary work necessary to a new history has been done. The present writer has no intention of undertaking this work; he cannot even pretend to such knowledge of the Jewish literature as can make a beginning for such a study; he can only hope to point out what seem to be certain possible openings with promise of fruitfulness.

In the first place, then, let us consider the political conditions under which the Jews found themselves when our period opens. In the days of their independence they had been located between two great empires, and had been forced to play a very precarious game in preserving the balance of power. In spite, however, of this difference in nationality, they had been a part and on the whole a satisfied part of the world-civilization which embraced alike the nations on the Nile, the Tigris, and the Euphrates. The coming of the Iranians meant no great change culturally, for the Persian government was tolerant; there was no persecution of religion or even of nationalism. The natural result was that new conceptions came in easily and found lodgment in the most orthodox of circles. This unity of civilization was reinforced as never before by the political condition. Under the rule of the Persians the civilized world came nearer to being under one control than ever before or since. We think of the Greek world as being independent, while as an actual fact the greatest cities were Persian; the remainder were in the Persian sphere of influence;

their policies constantly determined by their attitude toward the one power of the time. What is more to the point in our present study, the entire oriental world and all Jews, however scattered, came under the Persian sway and recognized a common master.

The importance of this factor cannot be overestimated. It meant a welding together of all Jews, however scattered, into one cultural and political whole, with an obvious unity, whatever the difference in detail. In Palestine itself, rulers and people alike were in close touch with their non-Jewish neighbors, and not the influence of an Ezra or a Nehemiah could bring them away.

No difference was made by the conquests of Alexander, whose idea was not, as so often assumed, the forcing of Hellenism on the oriental world. Politically he took over completely the oriental conception of empire, and to a large degree he was oriental in his social conceptions as well. The turning-point is rather marked by the premature death of the great conqueror, though no one recognized it at the time, and though the political theory which ruled the Macedonian states was still that of the earlier empires. His successors, however, would have none of Alexander's further schemes of orientalizing. Although they allowed perfect freedom of worship and of customs; though an Antiochus I might speak in the old language to the gods of Babylon, it was mere form. However they might differ in details, the Macedonian kings were all strong proponents of the policy of Hellenization. Not that they persecuted; that would have been too crude; and if the rulers were Macedonian, their advisers were Greek, the subtlest race the world has seen. The Hellenized simply had the favor of the rulers. The language of the court and of administration, of business and of society, was Greek. Commerce with the wider world thrown open by the advance from the West was possible only in Greek, and the Phoenician metics who have left their inscriptions in their native language in Athens and the Piraeus had paved the way.<sup>1</sup> The cities had been turned into Greek imperial colonies where the leading spirits spoke and thought Greek. A new and less austere life might be lived in these urban surroundings and the younger generation inevitably fell under the spell. Nor was the appeal alone to

<sup>1</sup> *CIS*, II, 115 ff.

the libertine, as all will testify who have felt the charm of Homer and Herodotus, of Sophocles and Aristophanes, of Plato and Theocritus. No wonder that Hellenization went on apace, that the very gods brought themselves into the fashion by identification with Greek deities, surrendered their names to be received back as attributes, rebuilt their temples on the model of the world-famous buildings of Athens, changed their liturgy to resemble that of the Olympians, translated their ancestral laws into the terms of Greek philosophy.

How could the Jews do otherwise? The very first of the fathers who received the Torah from the last of the Great Synagogue is known to us only by the name of Antigonus, and Antigonus was the name of Macedonian monarchs who had been worshiped as god-kings.<sup>1</sup> That later and anti-Hellenistic Judaism permitted his name to occupy this position of supreme importance is ample testimony to the possibility of Hellenization in the very line of Torah descent. The first Onias did not think it unfitting a high priest to claim relationship with Sparta.<sup>2</sup> If the translation of the Septuagint was carried out in Egypt, the legend specifically states that the elders who translated the law came from the most pious circles in Palestine. Long after the Maccabean revolt, some time later than 132 B.C. and in 114 B.C., respectively, the wisdom of Sirach and the Book of Esther were translated by Palestinian Jews who came to Egypt. In the former case we have obviously a man not far from the Pious, though more worldly; in the latter we have a priest and Levite named Dositheus; his son is Ptolemy, also the name of a god-king, and the translator is a citizen of Jerusalem named Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy. Clearly, Hellenism is not dead when pious Jews were named from such worshiped rulers.<sup>3</sup> When we find a later Onias appearing as a *euergetes* of his city, *kedemon* for his fellow-nationalists, *zealot* for the *nomoi*,<sup>4</sup> we instinctively think of the phraseology of the Greek *stephanos* inscription and as inevitably recall that decree from Athens which is almost a literal translation into Phoenician of a Greek "crown-

<sup>1</sup> Pirque Aboth, I, 3.

<sup>2</sup> I Macc. 12:7.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, pp. 127 ff.

<sup>4</sup> II Macc. 4:2.

ing" inscription.<sup>1</sup> Onias is specifically labeled as the head of the anti-Greek party, yet when in danger of his life he had no scruple in fleeing to sanctuary at Daphne, the most immoral of all Syrian shrines, and the chronicler sees nothing out of the way in his action.<sup>2</sup> Nor does he see anything out of the way in the state support of sacrifices at Jerusalem by Seleucus IV.<sup>3</sup> Considering the small amount of source material from this period, the illustrations are striking. They indicate beyond cavil that the men who were recognized as rightful and righteous leaders of the people were by no means averse to taking over much of Hellenic culture. Nor can we blame them, certainly not those the very words of whose master have come down only in Greek dress, whose most sacred books were written in Greek or have come down only in Greek translation, whose theology is so largely conditioned by Plato and his successors.

The reaction against Hellenism in the Near East was in the first instance political. The almost immediate slipping away of India had little effect on the lands around the eastern Mediterranean, and perhaps we can predicate little more from the first revolt of Parthia in the middle of the third century before the Christian Era. So rapid was the progress of the Parthians when once fairly started on their advance that its reverberations must strangely have stirred the orientals of the West. To those who are seeking fresh identifications of late prophecies, this is respectfully commended as a subject for investigation! The failure of Antiochus the Great to recover his lost provinces in the East was of tremendous significance. But of still greater significance is the fact that just at the time, perhaps in the same year that Antiochus Epiphanes ascended the throne of the Seleucidae, there became king in Parthia that Mithradates who was destined to rob the empire of its fairest provinces. These successes were won after the death of Antiochus and so after the Jewish insurrection, but there will be no cause for astonishment if some day we shall discover a causal connection between the accession of Mithradates and the Jewish revolt of a few years later. By the time the Maccabees revolted,

<sup>1</sup> Renan, *Rev. Arch.* (Ser. III), XI, 5; *IG*, IV, 1335b.

<sup>2</sup> II Macc. 4:33.

<sup>3</sup> II Macc. 3:3.

Mithradates had begun his long career of conquest, and vast movements were obviously impending. We need not assume that the Parthian king sent an embassy to Mattathias urging him to revolt. Revolt of East against West was in the air. Hellenization was doomed in India and in the trans-Caspian areas; it was fighting a losing battle in Bactria, where its rulers were abandoning their Hellenic dress, including the hat so emphasized on the earlier coins, writing on those coins barbarous Greek or using the native characters, their very feature no longer showing the Greek type of countenance. There went through the East the same tremor of expectation which passed through those very regions after Japan defeated Russia, when Muslims in their coffee-houses gravely discussed the supplanting by an Asiatic and a non-Christian power of the mighty Christian empire they had so long feared. And just as Pan-Islam and Pan-Turanism and Pan-Arabism followed, so in the ancient Near East there was a stirring among the dead bones. The East was slowly awakening to the fact that the Hellenistic civilization was after all alien, that it represented a yoke that must be cast off.

One of the fallacies widely spread among us because of the use of the bipartisan system in Anglo-Saxon countries is the belief that there must always be two opposing parties. As an actual fact, up to this time there seems to have been but one party of any effective position, that of the moderate Hellenizers. It certainly did include all the respectable elements of the Jewish nation, the nobles, the administrators, the intellectuals, the youth who wore the hat, and, since the high priests were the administrative heads, in so far as nationalism was recognized by the empires, the priestly class as well. Ezra and Nehemiah seemed to have left no successors, at least among the leaders. Yahweh had become Hellenized as well as Marduk or Atargetis. If Yahweh really were the same as Zeus, then a descendant of Aaron might perfectly well take the name of Jason, a pretender to the high priesthood Menelaus, for these too had most certainly been favorites of that same Zeus.

We need not be surprised at such a phenomenon. Much has been written more or less wisely as to the unchanging character of the Jew. Actual history has another story to tell. Almost we are tempted to apply the biological analogy, to assume that the Jewish



people has been composed of two fundamentally different races, one looking west, the other east, one easily assimilated to western culture, the other impossible of assimilation. Almost we are tempted to assume that, according to the Mendelian law, these two elements are united in unstable equilibrium, constantly throwing off groups which are stably Eastern, others which are stably Western, still others which remain unstable and continue to pass through the same process. Biological analogies are at best dangerous and at worst notorious. This suggestion is fanciful to a degree, and yet we do know that the original population of Palestine was highly mixed and that this process, or something like it, has been going on throughout all later history. Consider, for example, the irony of a situation in which Pan-Turanism, the union of such races as Turks, Hungarians, Finns, and Tatars, boasts as its chief advocate a man with the Hungarian name of Vámbéry who was originally named Bamberger and is by descent a Jew!<sup>1</sup>

A second party was nevertheless in the process of formation. If Ezra and Nehemiah had found no successors among the leaders, there were still men who cherished their ideals with more enthusiasm than the men who believed that the Law could be reconciled with Hellenism. Its growth was that of a popular movement and, like all such movements which have found their origin among the common people, its beginnings are and doubtless always will be obscure. We all the more must regret this obscurity, for a considerable portion of the literature in our older sacred books comes from these Hasidim, and if we could but date their beginnings we could likewise date their written productions. Their effusions are found especially in the great service-book we call the Psalms, and however they may have been worked over in the process of fitting them to be the service-book of the nation, many of them still retain sufficient traces of group consciousness and even of personal feeling to make it clear that they point to a very definite situation. And that situation is pre-Maccabean. We have, accordingly, in the Hasidean Psalms, the first beginnings of a movement against the all-overwhelming Hellenism. These groups of Pious were, however, of a purely religious character. There was

<sup>1</sup> R. W. Seton-Watson, *Racial Problems in Hungary*, p. 187.

a distinct lack of nationalistic consciousness, a failure to see the political implications of the movement.

This full implication was first seen by a simple priest of the conservative countryside, Mattathias of Modin. But it was not forced upon his attention until there had come about something like the religious persecution which we so often state was alien to the ancient classical world. So far as the Greeks and Romans are concerned, this is notoriously true, that there never was persecution for religion as such, but merely prosecution, such as in principle we countenance today for offenses against the state, its dominant political theories, the public welfare as shown by the ancestral laws, the common morality.

In our study of the persecution of the Hasideans, too much emphasis has been laid on the somewhat bizarre character of Antiochus IV. We may doubt whether he was more inclined than his predecessors to Hellenize his subjects; we may certainly doubt whether he was any more conscious of his godlike character as king than Alexander, Ptolemy the Savior, Antiochus the God. In so far, then, as we have persecution and not prosecution, we have something un-Greek. The real cause, unless we completely misread our primary sources, must be found in the internal conditions of the Jewish nationality, in the hatred of the Hellenized leaders for the Hasidean lower classes.<sup>1</sup> Struggle always drives men to the logical extremes of their thoughts; it made the Hasideans more pious, it forced the Hellenizers to complete the identification with Zeus Olympius, and to associate with Yahweh, mentioned under this name, the god-king Antiochus Epiphanes, "the God Made Manifest." Once again there was worship of king and deified nation as there was before of Ashur and Yahweh, as there was to be in Aelia Capitolina of Rome and Augustus. In this picture the author of I Maccabees is less true than his fellow, with his naïve belief that the process of Hellenization began in the reign of Antiochus IV, that it was due to separation from the nations round about, a separation possible on the part of the extreme Pious, not of the nation as a whole, who were in the closest contact with the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. especially Radin, *Jews among the Greeks and Romans*, pp. 130 ff.

surrounding peoples. Nor is he correct in making the persecution almost exclusively that of the king; the second book shows the part played by the Hellenizing Jews. May we suspect that there was a further element in the situation, that the Hasideans were pointed out by their opponents as pro-Egyptians, as longing for the Ptolemaic rule, of which many of them still retained a vivid memory?<sup>1</sup>

The Hasidim were not only or primarily representatives of the first faint stirrings of reaction against the West. They were pietists, even pacifists, we might call them now, and they relied on passive resistance. The men who died in their innocency that they might not profane the Sabbath by fighting on it may merely have formed the extreme wing; they truly represented the general feeling of the group.<sup>2</sup> Mattathias represented a different ideal, that of direct action. He and his sons were successful to a degree. For the moment there was a certain fusing of parties, and all but the extreme Hasidim came over to his side and were willing to fight under the banner of Judas. The term Hasidim might even come to be used for the party of Judas as a whole.<sup>3</sup>

Never was there a sadder example of deflected ideals. Mattathias began the fight for freedom against all that was Hellenic. Barely had he begun the war when he died, and scarcely had he been buried when his son Judas began to show himself the practical politician. After his first great victory at Beth zur, he sent ambassadors to arrange a *modus vivendi* with Lysias, the regent of Antiochus V, and was willing to receive the pretender Menelaus as go-between.<sup>4</sup> The supposedly pious author of II Maccabees has not concealed the further compromising fact that shortly after the failure of this attempt at settlement, another was undertaken through Nicanor. Note how this compromise was evidently between the two Jewish parties as well, for one of Nicanor's ambassadors is Mattathias, a sufficiently Jewish name, not to speak of the presence of the high priest Alcimus. The agreement was formally approved by the Jewish people, and as formally executed. The anti-Semitic camp followers were sent away, and a friendship

<sup>1</sup> Bouché-Leclercq, *Hist. des Séleucides*, p. 276.

<sup>3</sup> II Macc. 14:6.

<sup>2</sup> I Macc. 2:29 ff.

<sup>4</sup> II Macc. 11:17 ff.

developed between Judas and Nicanor. Through the urging of the latter, the former married and settled down to live the common life. That this failed through Alcimus, who was not successful in securing recognition as high priest, could not lessen the sin of Judas in the minds of the faithful. Our author, or rather his source, pointed the moral by contrasting the case of the elder Razis who, in the former times of "non-intercourse" with the Gentiles, had been in danger of his life through his attachment to the true Judaism. The "former times of non-intercourse" is without doubt sharply contrasted with the "common life together" of the various opposing groups for which the Pious held Judas responsible. A little later the epitomist answers this implied criticism by the statement that Judas was the protagonist in behalf of his fellow-citizens, that he retained throughout life his youthful desire to do good to his fellow-nationalists, but this only brings into the sharper contrast the two points of view. Razis risked his life for Judaism; Judas for Judaea. Both in the author's opinion deserved credit for *eunoia*, but they represented two different points of view.<sup>1</sup>

When we turn to I Maccabees, we have difficulty in fitting together the events mentioned by both, but the general picture is the same. No less than the second book of that name, the first has its "tendency" the more insidious because it is hidden under a seemingly naïve matter-of-fact chronicle style. Both alike were composed after the break between Hasmoneans and Pharisees had reached open war; both have as their chief motive the glorification of the Maccabees and so of their descendants now occupying the throne; both tend to depreciate their opponents; both are religious, different only in the relative weight assigned to this feature of their heroes, but this is a difference which may easily be exaggerated. One loves to narrate marvels, the other avoids excess of religious expression. In both, the religion is that of the sturdy fighting man so often seen as hypocrisy by the man of peace, with its combination of an unreasoning acceptance of the main outlines and an ignoring of essential detail and an often unethical conduct. Most emphatically pietism and pacifism are far from

<sup>1</sup> II Macc., chaps. 14 f.

the thought of both.<sup>1</sup> How unfair even the author of the first book can be is shown by I Macc. 5:61 ff.: "There was a great overthrow among the people because they hearkened not unto Judas and his brethren, thinking to do some great exploit. *But they were not of the seed of those men by whose hand deliverance was given unto Israel.* And the man Judas was glorified." Note also how he does not approve of the priests who wish to show themselves good men and true by fighting, and how their death in battle is referred to their lack of sense in going to war. How exclusive is this concentration of both authors on the Maccabees is shown by their ignoring of the Hasidim. In the second book they appear but once, as partisans of Judas. In the first they are mentioned twice. Once they are united with the Maccabees and have success. In the second passage they break away from him, return to the legitimate high priest Alcimus, and of course receive their reward in being treacherously killed by him. The moral is obvious—with the Maccabees, success; without them, death.

This last passage is instructive. Alcimus attempts to win over all, even Judas, but he and his brethren will have none of him and of his deceitful words of peace. However, many did desert Judas and there did gather unto Alcimus a "synagogue" of the scribes, who sought out righteousness. Now this is perfectly clear; these

<sup>1</sup> Space will not permit a discussion of the numerous and complicated problems connected with the two books of Maccabees. It will be observed from the text that a comparatively conservative viewpoint prevails, and that the second book is given even more authority than the first. In general, the point of view has some relation to that of Niese, *Hermes*, XXXV, 268 ff., 453 ff., and like his has been secured in the attempt to work out an actual history of the events in question, the only method of testing source results. This does not mean that the data are taken without criticism, but that, following the standard rules of historical research, the investigation of an intermediate source is comparatively unimportant as compared with the test which must be given each fact as it stands isolated and in relation to other known facts. Thus tested, even the letters, often composed from report and suffering from errors which have not been improved by incorporation in a written history, may be used to tell a story which is consistent with the general picture. In II Macc. 11:17 ff., for example, the acts behind are so little creditable to Judas and so disagree with the narrative in which they are embedded that we must assume they would not have been inserted unless they were already in existence and were believed to be true. Note especially that this letter material is primarily political in character and does not fit the more religious work in which it has been incorporated.

scribes came to Alcimus because it was only just that the legitimate high priest should rule them. It was only natural that first of all the children of Israel came the Hasidim, for they said, "There has come with the troops a man from the seed of Aaron, and he will do no wrong to us." Alcimus was willing enough to swear to them, but shortly after killed sixty in a single day. The author of the book very appositely quotes Psalm 79:2 f.: "The flesh of thy saints and their blood they poured out round about Jerusalem and there was no one to bury them." By his time this passage had come to be scripture, and he quoted it in reference to the Hasidim in the usual custom of finding in the Sacred Book something to meet the situation. How surprised he would have been had it been suggested to him that this psalm actually referred to these very same Pious and in all probability had been composed but a few years before the Maccabean revolt!

The episode is equally illuminating as proving how impossible it was for each of the parties to understand the other. To the Hellenist Alcimus, the Pious could only be enemies of his group to the point of actual warfare; peace should be promised to them only long enough to plan their destruction. He never dreamed that they might be content to settle down quietly under his rule. In spite of themselves, it became clear to the Pious that the usurping Judas, with all his faults and with no ancestral right to lead them, was after all zealous in his fashion for the Law; the rightful heir was hopelessly alien to their dreams. The people as a whole came to see that there was no truth, that is, knowledge of the Law, nor power of giving true judgment. This misunderstanding cost Alcimus dearly when the Seleucid troops were withdrawn and he stood alone.

The Hasidim were forced, therefore, to follow the Hasmoneans, but they could not forget that they had no legal status, and that they were none too strict. The end of Judas' reign saw still another proof that he looked west and not east, his embassy to Rome. Whether Judas realized all the implications of the action may be in doubt; his contemporaries knew perfectly well what it meant, but he could not have brought himself into the most remote client relationship with the great power of the West without recognizing

that he was dealing with another and the greatest of the states professing the Hellenic civilization, for this was the very time when Hellenism had taken Rome by storm. There is curious confirmation of this suspicion that Judas was not ignorant of the Hellenic sympathies of the body to which his ambassadors were to go, for both had Greek names, the more surprising in that their recorded ancestors had Hebrew, for Eupolemus was the son of John the son of Accos, and the other, Jason, was the son of Eleazer.<sup>1</sup> We may fancy as we will that one was the famous Jewish historian whose Greek writings on the Jews and the kings of the Jews have been preserved through Alexander Polyhistor and Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> that the other was the author of the source of II Maccabees. Such names could have been borne only by Jews who were in large part Hellenized; the names tell their own story. The opponents of Judas might be properly called Lawless; his own followers were by no means all Pious.

Judas was followed by Jonathan, with the position of archon and hegemon. He was frankly an opportunist, ready to fish in troubled waters. He soon made his peace with Bacchides and in a rival settlement at Michmash "judged" his fellow-nationals. With the arrival of Alexander Balas, Demetrius gave him virtual autonomy, and Jerusalem under the sway of the Hellenist Sanhedrin became his. Alexander made a still more attractive bid, ordering him to become high priest, and Jonathan dutifully obeyed. The office had been in abeyance for seven years, since the death of Alcimus, and might be said to have lapsed, but doubtless there were many who might claim descent from Aaron, whereas Jonathan was but the son of a simple country priest. Taking the situation at its best, Jonathan would have had difficulty in securing the support of the Pious. Add to this his purely worldly policy and social intercourse, even to eating with the heathen, and it is clear that the more extreme Jews could not accept his rule. This troubled Jonathan but little, for after he had declined the further offer of Demetrius, that Jerusalem should have the same right of sanctuary as the Phoenician states, should be called holy and

<sup>1</sup> I Macc., chap. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Huet. *Demonstr. Ev. Prep.* IV. C.2, is quoted by Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*, III, 208, as the first to hold this view.

inviolable, Alexander made him strategos and meridarch. The state, then, had the organization of a high priest and strategos at the head, of a gerusia of the ethnos, the priests as a separate class, and the people as a whole.

This assembling of the constituent parts of the government occurs in the letters sent with the embassy to Sparta and to Rome, and again we have to note the names of the ambassadors. Perhaps it is a son of that Jason who formerly went to Rome that we have in the equally Greek, or rather Macedonian, Antipater, who is the junior member, while the senior member is Numenius, the son of Antiochus. Families where the names of such god-kings as Antipater and Antiochus were in free use, where as in Numenius<sup>1</sup> the worship of the new moon was hinted at, were better adapted to furnish ambassadors to Hellenistic powers than to win the support of the Pious.

The capture of Jonathan left Simon to be appointed hegemon by the people. Demetrius confirmed Simon in his position as high priest, and, in addition to the usual favors, granted aphasis, that is, freedom. The expression is ambiguous; doubtless it was intended to be so in the original Greek, but to Simon and his nation it meant but one thing. In the triumphant words of our author, "The yoke of the Gentiles was lifted up from Israel, and the people of Israel began to write in their agreements and contracts 'First year of Simon, high priest and strategos and hegemon of the Jews.' " Soon after, this was sealed by the surrender of the citadel which for almost a generation had permitted the Hellenizers to dominate Jerusalem.

As reward, the people in the third year made a decree in Simon's favor which instinctively makes us think of the Greek inscription, in spite of the double tradition through which it has passed. It was issued by the great assembly of priests and laity, of the archons of the nation and the elders of the land. Simon is called high priest and perhaps something else. A long recital of the good deeds of the Maccabees follows, and it ends with the heaping up of honors to Simon, that he should be hegemon, high priest, general, ethnarch of the Jews and priests, prostates over all. It would be

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Ben Hodesh (בן הודש) of Citium (כרתים) in Cyprus, the Athenian *metic* who translated his name as Numenius in the bilingual, *CIS*, II, 117.



interesting could we translate back into equally technical Hebrew these purely Greek titles. Particularly worthy of note is the refusal to allow any sort of assembly without him.<sup>1</sup> Quite the most interesting thing about the whole transaction is the political theory behind it. There is not a hint of divine right. Its model might have been Rousseau's *Social Contract*, for, while all power is granted to the ruler, its source is still felt to be the Jewish people, in its three estates of clergy, nobles, and commons. Only when we realize the theory which ruled the political thought of the Hellenistic world do we realize the uniqueness of this conception. The monarch in the Hellenistic state was a god-king and as such he had absolute control of the state, not as an official but as a proprietor. Such a conception traced its direct ancestry from the elder oriental empires. We are the more astonished, therefore, to find in this same Orient a theory which is so opposed to both the theories held by thinkers of the Greek world of their day.

The same title of high priest was taken by John Hyrcanus on the death of his father. In his very first year Antiochus VII, who had already recognized his predecessor as high priest and ethnarch, made an attempt to subdue him. From our present point of view, the most interesting event was in connection with the Feast of Tabernacles, when Antiochus took advantage of the truce to send in rich gifts to be sacrificed in the temple. The implication was clear that the present Seleucid ruler was no Epiphanes and had no desire to attack the Jewish faith. It was a direct bid for the support of the Hasidim and Hyrcanus saw the point. In fear that he lose all but the nationalists, he at once made peace. He also decided that for the future he would depend on his mercenaries. With these he might destroy his enemies round-about, Idumaeans and Samaritans, and thus the yoke of the heathen was altogether cast off.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, we must not make the mistake of looking upon this as a religious crusade, to assume that he was a Jew first in religion and then in nationality.<sup>3</sup> How little emphasis he laid on his religious position is shown by his break with the truly Pious, now called the Pharisees, and by his

<sup>1</sup> I Macc., chap. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 236 ff.

<sup>3</sup> As Bouché-Leclercq, *Séleucides*, p. 408.

complete acceptance of the point of view of the Sadducees, for these, in spite of the fact that they included the official heads of the religion, were worldly in all their thinking. So sharply separated did the Pharisees come to be that they urged Hyrcanus finally to cease to act as high priest and content himself with the position of secular leader. Hyrcanus replied by changing his titles, as shown on the coins, from "Johanan, high priest *and* the people of the Jews," to "Johanan, high priest *and head* of the people of the Jews."<sup>1</sup> With such a denial of the co-ordinate authority of the people, kingship was but a step away.

The Pharisees, too, were now fully organized in their fraternities. If they were still little more than the Pious under another name, if they still played a small part in politics, they had at least taken a definite political attitude, and they were in open opposition to the Hasmoneans. Their hopes of a present earthly king destroyed, they began to dream. Some were modest enough, looking forward to the time when a genuine descendant of Aaron should be high priest, a descendant of David be king. As they copied the sacred scrolls so often destroyed or mutilated during the persecution of the preceding generation, they consoled themselves by penning in the margins promises that David should again reign in Jerusalem, "which I have chosen to place my name," "for my servant David's sake," "that David my servant may have a lamp always before me in Jerusalem." Or less frequently they inserted longer passages such as "If thou wilt walk in my statutes and execute my ordinances and keep all my commandments to walk in them, then will I establish my word with thee which I spake unto David thy father, and I will dwell among the children of Israel."<sup>2</sup>

Such were the pious hopes of the intellectuals, the scribes who meditated in the Law day and night. There were other spirits which could not be content patiently to wait the fulfilment of promises which depended merely on passive action. For them were more magnificent dreams, fragments of which we have in our apocalyptic literature. He who would understand the political

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. Hill, *Cat. of Greek Coins of Palestine*, pp. 188 ff.

<sup>2</sup> I Kings 8:11-13; cf. Olmstead, *AJSL*, XXX, 1 ff.; XXXI, 169 ff.; XXXIV, 145 ff.

thought of the time must indeed study long the concepts behind the wildest of the apocalyptic frenzy. So far as the parties condescended to play a part in practical politics, both were alike in hating the Hasmoneans and in looking forward to the happy day when they would be supplanted by the rightful rulers in church and state.

They had need of all their patience, for instead of the appearance of the expected Davidic king, the successor of Hyrcanus, Aristobulus, made the inevitable transition to kingship. Once more, we should be careful to understand just what this action means. It does not mean that the Jews became an independent people. If Aristobulus thus cast off the last trace of Seleucid suzerainty, his predecessors long ago had almost unconsciously slipped into a position of clientage to the mighty Roman republic. By this time it required no great ability as a statesman to realize that all the client rulers, whatever their titles, were but puppets in the hand of the least of the Roman aristocrats. The title of king, then, meant merely the assumption of a higher position of honor in the political world dominated by Rome, as that of Philhellene meant the acceptance of a position among the Hellenistic states of the East. How fully this position had been accepted by his father is shown by the names he gave to his sons, Aristobulus, Antigonus, Alexander, names consecrated by generations of Macedonian rulers who had been acclaimed as king-gods.

While the Maccabees had been fighting for an independent kingdom in the break-up of the Seleucide empire, two other empires, Rome and Parthia, had been approaching from either side, and the subject nationalities which for the moment had sensed independence soon found that in reality they had but secured a more or less concealed dependence on one or the other. When these two powers came to a somewhat unstable equilibrium with the boundary of their respective spheres of influence along the line of the Euphrates, the Near East was divided almost equally between them. The Jews were likewise halved and the Jewish people entered upon the second phase of that conflict between East and West which was yet more terribly to divide them and bring upon them a yet more fearful fate.